IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO : 25158 of 1997

Between:

Siddhardha Constructions Pvt., Ltd., rep.by it's Managing Director,N.Surender Babu, S/o. N.Janardhan Rao, R/o. 47-15-13,
Dwaraka nagar, Visakhapatnam -16.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Nellore.
2 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Davaleshwaram.
3 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Hyderabad.
4 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Guntur.
5 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Visakhapatnam.
6 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Ongole.
7 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Chittoor.
8 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Eluru.
9 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Bobbili.
10 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Vijayawada.
11 The Chief Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Erramanzil,
Hyderabad.

12 The Chief Engineer,
South Central Railway, Rail Nilayam,
Secunderabad.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue Writ or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of direction more particularly one in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ declaring the action of the respondents in not issuing the tender schedules of the contract works to the petitioner as illegal, arbitrary and unreasonable for consequently direct the respondents to issue tender schedules of the Contract Works to the petitioner herein without insisting for production of Commercial Tax Clearance Certificate and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.C.H.SATISH KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondents 1 to 11: G.P.for Irrigation

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

Learned counsel for the petitioner represents that the cause in this writ petition does not survive and has become infructuous. Recording the same, the writ petition is dismissed as having become 'infructuous'. No costs.

_____

23.03.2005

Jsu/Tvk

To

1 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Nellore.
2 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Davaleshwaram.
3 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Hyderabad.
4 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Guntur.
5 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Visakhapatnam.
6 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Ongole.
7 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Chittoor.
8 The Superintending Engineer,

Irrigation circle, Eluru.

9 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Bobbili.

10 The Superintending Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Vijayawada.

11 The Chief Engineer,
Irrigation circle, Erramanzil,
Hyderabad.

12 The Chief Engineer,
South Central Railway, Rail Nilayam,
Secunderabad.

13 2 CD copies